Institut de Recerca en Economia Aplicada Regional i Pública
Research Institute of Applied Economics

Document de Treball 2013/06 40 pàg.
Working Paper 2013/06 40 pag.

"Fiscal sustainability and fiscal shocks in a dollarized and oil-exporting country: Ecuador"

María Lorena Marí Del Cristo and Marta Gómez-Puig

Institut de Recerca en Economia Aplicada | *Research Institute of Applied Economics*

IREA
Institut de Recerca en Economia Aplicada Regional i Pública
Research Institute of Applied Economics
Universitat de Barcelona
Av. Diagonal, 690 • 08034 Barcelona

WEBSITE: www.ub.edu/irea/ • CONTACT: irea@ub.edu

The Research Institute of Applied Economics (IREA) in Barcelona was founded in 2005, as a research institute in applied economics. Three consolidated research groups make up the institute: AQR, RISK and GiM, and a large number of members are involved in the Institute. IREA focuses on four priority lines of investigation: (i) the quantitative study of regional and urban economic activity and analysis of regional and local economic policies, (ii) study of public economic activity in markets, particularly in the fields of empirical evaluation of privatization, the regulation and competition in the markets of public services using state of industrial economy, (iii) risk analysis in finance and insurance, and (iv) the development of micro and macro econometrics applied for the analysis of economic activity, particularly for quantitative evaluation of public policies.

Abstract

This paper investigates the fiscal sustainability of an emerging, dollarized, oil-exporting country: Ecuador. A cointegrated VAR approach is adopted in testing, first, if the intertemporal budget constraint is satisfied in Ecuador and, second, in identifying the permanent and transitory shocks that affect a fiscal policy characterized by inertia and a heavy dependence on oil revenues. Following confirmation that the debt-GDP ratio does not place the Ecuadorian budget under any pressure, we reformulate the model and identify two forces that push the fiscal system out of equilibrium, namely, economic activity and oil revenues implemented in the government budget. We argue that Ecuador needs to recover control of its monetary policy and to promote the diversification of its economy in order that non-oil tax revenues can replace oil revenues as a pushing force. Finally, we calculate quarterly elasticities of tax revenues with respect to Ecuador's GDP and that of eight Eurozone countries. We illustrate graphically how the Eurozone countries with low positive or high negative elasticities' levels suffer debt problems after the crisis. This finding emphasizes the pressing need for Ecuador to strengthen the connection between its tax revenues and output, and also suggests that the convergence of these elasticities in the Eurozone might contribute to the success of an eventually future fiscal union.

JEL classification: C32, E62, H60
Keywords: Cointegrated VAR, fiscal sustainability, fiscal shocks, debt, Ecuador.

María Lorena Marí Del Cristo: Department of Economics. University of Barcelona, Av. Diagonal 690. Barcelona 08034. Tel. +34 934 021 933. Email: lmari@ub.edu

Marta Gómez-Puig: Department of Economics. University of Barcelona and Risk Center-IREA, Av. Diagonal 690. Barcelona 08034. Tel. +34 934037240. Email: marta.gomezpuig@ub.edu

Acknowledgements

This article is based upon work supported by the Government of Spain and FEDER under grant number ECO2010-21787-C03-01.
The authors would like to express their gratitude to Katarina Juselius and Søren Johansen for helpful comments.

1. Introduction

Compared to the large body of empirical literature analysing the effects of monetary policy, economic research examining the effects of fiscal policy has been much scarcer until recently. Nevertheless, the current sovereign debt crisis in the euro area has revived the academic and policy debate on the economic impact of expansive fiscal policies and high public debt levels. It is worth to note that market concerns with respect to fiscal sustainability in euro area countries have grown and spread to other countries, reinforcing the concern that high public debt levels harm economic growth.

In this context, Ecuador is a particularly interesting country to study. The fact that it relies on its fiscal policy to counteract both external and internal shocks should, it is assumed, result in the failure of current budget constraints. However, on the contrary, as Figure 1 in Annex II shows, Ecuador has not had to cut its expenditure and, moreover, reports a falling total debt-GDP ratio, two unlikely achievements for its European counterparts immersed in the current economic crisis.

Figure 1 describes the pronounced decline that Ecuadorian debt-GDP ratio experienced since 2000. This decline has to be understood in the specific context of this South-American country, notwithstanding. On the peak of a devastating economic crisis, Ecuador was forced to default on its Brady bonds ($6.604 million of the total debt) in the summer of 1999. The restructuring process, officially in August 2000, resulted in a reduction of close to 40 percent in the face value of the tendered bonds. After this event, Ecuador focused on its fiscal policy on debt reduction. Through the Organic Law on Fiscal Responsibility, Stabilization and Transparency[1], in 2002, was created the Stabilization Fund for Social and Productive Investment and Debt Reduction (FEIREP) as a special trust fund, managed by the Central Bank. The FEIREP funds earmarked 70 percent for debt-buyback operations; 20 percent to stabilize oil revenues and for emergency spending, and 10 percent for education and health spending. The Fund was replaced in 2005 by the Special Account of the Productive and Social Reactivation, Development of Science and Technology and the Fiscal Stabilization (CEREPS). The 70 percent earmarking to debt reduction was reduced to 35 percent[2]. The debt-GDP ratio fell from 86 percent by end-2000 to about 34 percent by end-2006. However, this targeted debt reduction policy carried out by the government caused the revalorization of its international bonds, becoming the debt buyback even more

[1] See the third title of the original version of the Organic Law on Fiscal Responsibility, Stabilization and Transparency published in the Ecuadorian Official Registry on June 4, 2002.
[2] See Cueva (2008) for a more extensive description about the FEIREP and CEREPS funds.

onerous. This fact was the basis of the debt repudiation rhetoric of president Correa[3]. In December 2008 the debt-GDP ratio achieved a value around 23 percent. The public external debt was the least burdensome it had been in over three decades. Nevertheless, Ecuador decided to default again, making clear its "unwillingness to pay" rather than its "inability to pay"[4].

Most studies in the literature have examined the effects of fiscal policy on macroeconomic variables in order to provide robust stylized facts regarding the effects of fiscal policy shocks. The discrepancies that exist, it is argued, result from the different methodologies adopted to analyse these shocks (see Caldara and Kamps, 2008). Irrespective however of the identification approach selected, all the studies concur that positive government spending shocks have persistent positive output, inflation and short term interest rate effects[5].

The same holds for tax shocks. There is a degree of consensus in articles using the sign-restrictions approach (Mountford and Uhlig, 2009) or a narrative approach (Romer and Romer, 2010) that unanticipated tax increases have strongly negative output effects. However, conflicting results are obtained when using the structural VAR approach, so that while Blanchard and Perotti's (2002) findings coincide with the aforementioned studies, Perotti (2002) suggests that output – as well as the inflation and short term interest rate – are unaffected[6].

Recently, these models have been extended to satisfy the government budget constraint[7]. Since the fiscal variables of different countries react distinctly to macroeconomic variable shocks, such analyses should shed some light on how best to harmonize fiscal policies in monetary unions. Favero et al. (2011) identify the existence of heterogeneities between countries due to different

[3] See Correa (2005).

[4] The most controversial default was that made in 2008. President Rafael Correa justified the country's moratorium on the basis that Ecuador's foreign debt obligations were "immoral," "illegal" and "illegitimate". Ecuador stopped payments on 3.2 billion, confined to two of the country's sovereign bonds: the one maturing in 2012 and another due in 2030, both born out of an earlier sovereign default that took place in August 1999 and accounting for nearly one-third of the external public debt in 2008. Between April and November 2009, the government repurchased the two bonds against cash at a steep discount of 65-70 percent on their face value. See Moodys (2009), Salmon (2009), Das, Papaioannou and Trebesch (2012), Feibelman (2010) and Díaz-Cassou et al. (2008) in order to go in depth on the Ecuadorian defaults over the last decade.

[5] In the case of government spending, Perotti (2008) reports that both private consumption and real wages significantly and persistently increase in response to a positive spending shock, while employment does not react. Mountford and Uhlig (2009) find that the response of private consumption is close to zero and statistically insignificant, while Ramey (2011) reports a negative response to such a shock. Burnside et al. (2004) provide evidence that the real wage persistently and significantly falls while employment persistently and significantly increases.

[6] It should be stressed that all these studies were undertaken using a very similar US sample period. Mountford and Uhlig (2009) and Romer and Romer (2010) simply extend the sample period first studied in Blanchard and Perotti (2002) which ran from 1947:1 to 1997:4.

[7] For instance, Favero and Giavazzi (2007) estimate a fiscal VAR applying two approaches: structural VAR and a narrative approach.
They include debt and the stock-flow identity linking debt and deficits, and report more sizeable effects of fiscal policy on output in
the narrative approach than in the standard structural VARs.

fiscal reaction functions, different degrees of openness, and different debt dynamics. They also highlight the importance of including feedback between fiscal and macroeconomic variables in VAR models, since it conditions the reactions of both variable types to fiscal shocks.

Bohn (1998) adds to the debate about fiscal sustainability by demonstrating that rejections of low-order difference-stationarity and cointegration are consistent with the intertemporal budget constraint and he suggests that error-correction-type policy reactions are a promising alternative for understanding debt and deficit problems. He also estimates a positive response of primary surpluses to the debt-GDP ratio, suggesting the sustainability of US fiscal policy for the sample period 1916-1995. Other empirical studies adopting the same line include Bohn (2005, 2007) for the US; Collignon (2012) for Europe; Fincke and Greiner (2012) for selected countries in the euro area; and, Kia (2008) who undertakes the analysis for two emerging countries (Iran and Turkey).

Few studies to date have examined Ecuador's fiscal policy. Cueva (2008) and Almeida et al. (2005) report that the legal framework is cumbersome regarding the distribution and earmarking of oil and tax revenues, creating large rigidities in fiscal management. They describe a "rigid budget characterised by inertia" that offers just eight percentage points to counteract unpredictable shocks[8]. Other articles examining issues of debt sustainability include López-Calix (2003) and Tinsley (2003), who adopt standard approaches to sustainability; Barnhill and Kopits (2003) who, in developing a Value-at-Risk approach, find that the volatility of sovereign spreads and of oil prices constitute major sources of risk for Ecuador's public sector; and Alvarado et al. (2004), who calculate debt threshold sensitivities for different assumptions regarding revenue volatility and expenditure adjustments. They emphasize that uncertainty in government tax revenues and the inflexibility in its non-interest expenditure leave Ecuador vulnerable to fiscal crises in the future.

Mejía et al. (2006) claim that dollarization reforms have limited the diapason of fiscal instruments available to governments. They warn of the dangers of dependency on oil revenues as a source of instability in a balanced budget. Marí Del Cristo and Gómez-Puig (2013) also remark the imminent inflation pressures in Ecuador due to the rise of pass-through and an inexistent monetary policy to deal with. These findings might question the theory that low-inflation policies increase the confidence of bond market investors, and governments may, therefore, have even greater access to borrowing. Actually, fixed exchange rates and dollarization restrain monetary policy but leave open debt-financed fiscal policy, at least until debt burdens become unsustainable (Palley, 2004).

[8] The composition of public expenditure is as follows: 26 per cent for wages, 10 per cent for current transfers, 8 per cent for transfers to regional governments (*gobiernos seccionales*), 3 per cent for investment projects, 10 per cent for interest payments and 32 per cent for amortizations, among other expenditures.

This article has two aims: first, to determine if Ecuadorian fiscal policy satisfies the intertemporal budget constraint and, second, to determine the main push factors and forces of adjustment (permanent and transitory shocks) interacting in the long run equilibrium. The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section II briefly describes the theoretical approach of the intertemporal budget constraint extended to oil-exporting countries. Section III presents the econometric methodology. Section IV explains the empirical results. Section V examines the policy implications based on an examination of elasticities of tax revenues with respect to Ecuador's GDP and that of eight Eurozone countries. Finally, section VI summarizes the conclusions that can be drawn from the article.

2. The Theoretical Model

An increasing debt-GDP ratio depends on the economic environment $(r_t - g_t)d_{t-1,}$ and on the primary surplus. If the interest rate r_t exceeds the growth rate g_t, then the debt-GDP ratio d_t will increase indefinitely unless there is a primary surplus which can offset the rising debt service.

The paths of public debt implied by the sequences of primary surplus s_t and economic environment $(r_t - g_t)$ are:

$$d_{t+n} = \left(\prod_{k=0}^{n}[1+(r-g)_{t+k}]d_{t-1} - \sum_{j=0}^{n}\left(\prod_{k=j+1}^{n}[1+(r-g)_{t+k}]\right) s_{t+j}\right. \qquad (1)$$

Assuming the economic environment as given and constant, the accumulation of debt over several periods t=1…n:

$$d_{t+n} = (1+r-g)^n d_t - \sum_{j=0}^{n}(1+r-g)^{n-j} s_{t+j} \qquad (2)$$

If we divide by $(1+r-g)^n$ and arrange terms:

$$\frac{1}{(1+r-g)^{t+n}} d_{t+n} = d_t - \sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{s_{t+j}}{(1+r-g)^j} \qquad (3)$$

Assuming that the transversality condition holds[9], fiscal policy will satisfy the intertemporal budget constraint (IBC) because it is on a path whereby the present value of expected future primary surpluses equals the initial debt:

$$d_t = E\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{s_{t+j}}{(1+r-g)^j}\right) \quad (4)$$

Equation (4) states that debt sustainability requires a variation in the primary budget surplus. A surplus is needed when the growth rate falls below the rate of return on government bonds. Thus, whether fiscal policy is sustainable or not depends on the sign of the fiscal policy reaction with respect to the target: if an increase in debt is followed by an increase in primary surpluses, debt is sustainable. In the long run, the debt-GDP ratio is required to converge on an equilibrium position that is determined by the nominal growth rate, target reference values and adjustment coefficients[10].

In order to explain the sustainability of oil-producing countries, Kia (2008) extends Barro's (1979, 1986) tax smoothing model by introducing energy revenues. In Barro's approach, the base of real taxable income is a deterministic variable y_t, a fixed fraction of real GDP that generally depends on the path of tax rates. Kia (2008) assumes GDP to be a function of the country's energy income.

Let τ_t be the average tax rate and $\tau_t y_t$ the real tax revenues. The total government revenues of an oil-producing country are, therefore, the sum of $\tau_t y_t$ and EN_t, the oil revenues derived from the exports of the natural resource. The government budget constraint, Equation (4), with constant real interest rate, r, and in a situation in which the country has energy income is:

$$d_t = E\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\tau y_{t+j} + EN_{t+j}) - (Gov_{t+j} + rd_{t+j-1})}{(1+r-g)^j}\right) \quad (5)$$

[9] The initial debt equals the expected present value of future primary surpluses if and only if discounted future debt converges to zero (Bohn, 2005).

[10] Collignon (2012) adopting the fiscal reaction function $\Delta s_t = \alpha(def_t - z_1) + \beta(debt_t - z_2)$ relates the deficit and debt ratios with the primary surplus. z_1 and z_2 are the target reference values for the deficit and debt ratios respectively under the Stability and Growth Pact; α and β are the adjustment speed coefficients by which governments respond to the deviation from the deficit and debt ratio reference values, respectively.

where the primary surplus S_{t+j} is now different from that in Equation (4) given the inclusion of EN_{t+j}[11].

In line with Kia (2008), we have to make several assumptions for empirical purposes. First, we assume that real government expenditure, Gov_t and the real tax base y_t can be expected to fluctuate around the common rate of the growth of the economy *g*. Second, the expected present value of energy income is also its current value. This means that all economic agents expect energy revenues not to change over the remaining life of the oil reserves[12]. Third, the oil reserves are expected to last forever. This assumption, however, is unsustainable based on OPEP's Annual Statistical Bulletin which states that Ecuador has about 8,235 million barrels of proven reserves and an exportable trend of 334 thousand barrels per day in 2011, that is, seventy per cent of its production. We thus simplify the model, including the fact that interest rates and price levels are kept constant, as we are analyzing a dollarized country[13].

If we resolve empirically that in the long run oil revenues, as opposed to non-oil tax revenues, are pushing away from the steady state, we can assume that this intertemporal budget constraint is not sustainable, given that oil revenues will dry up, unless the country diversifies its economy and substitutes the volatile oil sector with others that are more sustainable over time.

[11] Alvarado (2004) points out the main problem of this given that it assumes that increasing resource exploitation to pay the debt
does not affect sustainability. It is assumed that oil reserves have the same return as the government's other financial assets and
liabilities.

[12] Where t = m when the country's energy resources are exhausted, and I_t the information available at time t, including the state of the economy:

$$EN_t = E\left[\int_0^m EN_t e^{-rt} dt \,|I_t\right]$$

[13] We reject the null hypothesis of non-stationarity for Ecuadorian inflation.

3. Data and Econometric Methodology

The study of the dynamic response of macroeconomic variables to shifts in fiscal policy is usually carried out by estimating a vector autoregressive (VAR) model of the form:

$$X_t = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \prod_i X_{t-i} + e_t$$

Where X_t includes the minimum set of variables required for the VAR analysis, i.e., government spending net of interest, net tax revenues, output, inflation and interest rate (Perotti, 2002). Here, we extend this set to include the debt level, as Bohn (1998) has shown that the feedback obtained from the debt to tax and government spending ratios is statistically significant and economically relevant. The importance of monitoring debt dynamics when analysing fiscal policy has also been stressed by Romer and Romer (2010), Favero and Giavazzi (2007) and Favero et al. (2011)[14]. This result has clear implications for countries with fixed exchange rate regimes, including pegged or monetary union regimes.

We use monthly data from the Central Bank of Ecuador covering the period 2000:1 to 2012:7. The fiscal variables are the log of government expenditure net of interest $lgov_t$, the log of non-oil tax revenues $lrev_t$ and the log of oil revenues $lorev_t$. For the first model we use the sum of these last two figures to obtain the log of total fiscal revenues: $ltrev_t$. The remaining variables are the log of the Economic Activity Index (EAI) represented by $leai_t$ and the log of the external and internal debt-GDP ratio $ldebt\_gdp_t$. The EAI variable was chosen instead of GDP because Ecuador was dollarized in 2000:1 and GDP is only reported annually or quarterly; thus, in order to be able to use the highest number possible of observations from the dollarized period we include the EAI which is reported monthly. Hence, the first model we estimate comprises the following

[14] Romer and Romer (2010) claim that the effect of a US tax shock on output depends on whether the change in taxes is motivated by the government's desire to stabilize the debt or not. Favero and Gavazzi (2007) also find that interest rates depend on future monetary policy and the risk premium, both variables being affected by the debt dynamics. Hence, the absence of an effect of fiscal shocks on the long-term interest rates, a frequent outcome in VAR-based research that omits debt level, is due to a misspecification.

vector of endogenous variables: $X_t = [ltrev_t, lgov_t, leai_t, ldebt\_gdp_t]$[15]. We include neither the interest rate nor inflation, since both are constant throughout the sample period[16].

4. Empirical Results

We start with the CVAR specification. We first estimate the unrestricted VAR(k) model with different lag lengths k using general-to-specific testing and information criteria to determine a lag length with no autocorrelated error terms. With k=4, the model presents neither autocorrelation nor Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (ARCH) effects. However, normality is strongly rejected. The univariate tests show that normality is rejected due to the non-normality in the debt-GDP ratio variable: two outliers produce skewed residuals and generate excess kurtosis. The outliers are associated with two key moments in Ecuador's history when, as mentioned, its external debt was restructured: August 2000 and June 2009[17]. However, even when the first restructuring took place in August 2000, it was not until January 2001 that the total debt-GDP ratio illustrated the break level. We, therefore, introduce two unrestricted shift dummies: 2001:01 and 2009:06, that have the value 1 if *t* refers to any of those dates but is zero otherwise.

All our statistical tests are now acceptable. The univariate tests of normality only reveal some kurtosis in the residues of the debt-GDP variable but no skewness (which can be considered more serious than kurtosis)[18]. Thus, our model is well-specified and the empirical results are reliable.

Given that we have four trending variables, we allow for trends in the levels and a non-zero mean of the cointegration relations. Likewise, we allow for a trend in the cointegration relations, since

[15] Unlike Favero and Giavazzi (2007), we include the debt-GDP ratio among the endogenous variables, in order to capture the rich
dynamics of fiscal aggregates in the cointegrated VAR. As the government debt is an accumulation of budget deficits, if we include
the debt-GDP ratio we do not include the interest payments.

[16] The empirical application is carried out using CATS software, in line with Juselius (2006), who argues the advantages of employing the cointegrated VAR approach over others (cf. Hoover et. al (2007); Juselius, 2009). See Annex I to a brief explanation.

[17] The total external debt ratio was reduced from 106 per cent GDP at the end of 1999 to around 98 per cent in 2000 (Quispe-Agnoli, 2006). In June 2009 the Correa government defaulted on $3.2 billion of foreign public debt, and then completed a buyback of 91 percent of the defaulted bonds (Sandoval, 2009).

[18] Simulation studies have shown that valid statistical inference is sensitive to the violation of some of the assumptions, including parameter non-constancy, autocorrelated residuals (the higher, the worse) and skewed residuals, while quite robust to others, such as excess kurtosis and residual heteroscedasticity.

the trends in the levels do not cancel out in the cointegration relations. After testing the non-stationarity of the variables, we calculate the trace test statistics (Johansen, 1996), one including both seasonal and permanent dummies, and a second without dummies as a sensitivity analysis. Both tests determine the existence of one cointegration relation; thus, three common stochastic trends are pushing the system out of equilibrium.

Once the CVAR model is restricted to r=1 and has passed a number of diagnostic tests for parameter constancy, including the log-likelihood test or recursively calculated trace test statistics[19], we test the long-run exclusion and weak exogeneity hypotheses. These have been tested with a likelihood ratio test procedure described in Johansen (1996), Johansen and Juselius (1990) and Juselius (2006). If we accept the null hypothesis of the test of long run exclusion, i.e. a zero row restriction on β, the variable is not needed in the cointegration relations. Testing whether a variable is weakly exogenous is equivalent to test a zero row in α. When accepted it defines a common driving trend in the system since this variable does not adjust to the long run relations.

We check that the debt level variable can be excluded from the cointegration relation and the weak exogeneity test points to the variables that are pushing the system out of equilibrium, namely, the EAI and the government expenditure. Annex III presents the main tables (Table 1 and Table 2) related to these results.

These results can be read in more than one way; thus, it might be that Ecuador's debt-GDP ratio does not place the government under any pressure, or it might be that its intertemporal budget constraint cannot be described by cointegration relations if the debt is decreasing during most of the sample period while government expenditure rises[20], unless government revenues offset the difference. However, the revenue variable adjusts to the cointegration relation; it is not a variable pushing the system out of equilibrium. The variable which does present this condition is government expenditure, and this might confirm its inertial nature as described elsewhere or it might correspond to other forces not included in the model.

In order to determine the actual exogenous forces that make government expenditure a weak exogenous variable we estimate the following CVAR: $X_t = [lrev_t, lgov_t, leai_t, lorev_t]$. We divide total revenue between its oil and non-oil sources and exclude the debt-GDP ratio, since here again this variable can be excluded from the new model.

[19] Interestingly the test of constancy is rejected if the oil revenues variable is included in the model, confirming the volatility of
revenues of this type. All tests are available upon request.
[20] Ray and Kozameh (2012) and the World Bank (2005) provide further details about the expansive programs addressed at reducing
poverty levels and raising education levels.

From the previous model we retain the lag number and the deterministic terms, but we change the permanent dummy variables to 2005:4 and 2006:10 in order to avoid problems of skewness in the EAI and the oil revenue variable, respectively. We determine the rank with and without dummies and decide for r=2 without dummies (See Table 3). The exogeneity tests show the two possible common stochastic trends: economic activity and oil revenues (See Table 4).

Table 5 shows the residual correlations. The government expenses variable is related to both oil and non-oil tax revenues; and non-oil tax revenues are related to economic activity, oil revenues and government spending. Therefore, we need the structural MA representation, which requires structural and uncorrelated residues in order to interpret the empirical shocks adequately.

It can be derived from Annex I that if multiplying by a B matrix, then we add p*p additional parameters to the cointegrated VAR. This being the case, we need to impose exactly the same number of restrictions on the model's parameters to achieve a just-identification scheme. Since we have four variables, the B matrix adds 16 new coefficients. The assumption that u~IN (0,I) implies ((p*(p+1)/2) = 10) ten restrictions on B (four unit coefficients on the diagonal elements and six zero restrictions on the off-diagonal elements).

Four additional restrictions ((p-r)*r =4) are necessary to separate transitory from permanent shocks, and two more restrictions are required to achieve a just-identified structural MA model. The latter are essential because there are two possible sequences of the transitory shocks and two possible sequences of the permanent shocks. A single specification can be obtained by imposing one exclusion restriction on the common trend and one exclusion restriction on the transitory impulse response.

The impulse response functions are calculated with the following structurally identified MA model:

$$\begin{bmatrix} lrev_t \\ lgov_t \\ leai_t \\ lorev_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=t}^{t} u_{s1,i} \\ \sum_{i=t}^{t} u_{s2,i} \\ \sum_{i=t}^{t} u_{l1,i} \\ \sum_{i=t}^{t} u_{l2,i} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{s1,t} \\ u_{s2,t} \\ u_{l1,t} \\ u_{l2,t} \end{bmatrix} + C_1 B^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} u_{s1,t-1} \\ u_{s2,t-1} \\ u_{l1,t-1} \\ u_{21,t-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

The one exclusion restriction on the permanent shocks is defined by assuming that only supply shocks can affect economic activity in the long run; thus, oil revenues do not impact on production, as proxied by the $leai_t$ variable. The one exclusion restriction on the transitory shocks is defined by assuming "sticky" taxes, so tax revenues do not react immediately to a government expenditure shock.

The estimated matrix B normalized at the largest coefficient in each row in Table 7, defines how the orthogonalized permanent and transitory shocks are associated with the estimated CVAR residuals. Recovering the last two rows and substituting in the equation: $u_t = Be_t$ we obtain the combinations which make up the permanent shocks:

$$u_{l,1} = B'_{l,1}e_t = 0.103e_{lrev,t} - 0.11e_{lgov,t} + e_{leai,t} + 0.135e_{lorev,t}$$
$$u_{l,2t} = B'_{l,2}e_t = 0.233e_{lrev,t} - 0.961e_{lgov,t} + e_{leia,t} - 0.381e_{lorev,t}$$

It appears that both the first and the second permanent shocks are given primarily by shocks to the economic activity. The results suggest that oil revenue shocks have less influence, which can be considered a favourable outcome given the finite nature of oil reserves. The importance of the government spending shock is worth noting in the second permanent shock. This is in line with reports elsewhere that are critical of the rigid nature of Ecuador's public budget. Table 6 and Figure 7 in Annex III describe the dynamic impulse response functions after 23 periods for each of the system's variables resulting from a one standard deviation shock. We are able to verify that all the transitory shocks have a zero long-run impact on the four variables, whereas all permanent shocks have a non-zero impact, except for the identifying zero impact of economy activity. From this we can infer that oil revenues depend on both government demand and economic activity shocks, and that Ecuador needs to develop its fiscal system so as to ensure that tax revenues constitute not only the most important shock but also the most highly affected variable.

5. Policy implications based on budget revenues elasticity

Having completed the fiscal sustainability exercise based on a CVAR, we chose to conduct a further experiment based on fiscal revenues elasticities. Given that the debt-GDP ratio had not put the Ecuadorian government under pressure over the last decade, we sought to show, by drawing comparisons with the situation in Europe, the consequences of a fiscal policy that fails to stabilize and increase tax revenues.

Elasticities of different tax revenues (personal income taxes, corporate income taxes, indirect taxes, social security contributions and other receipts) and expenditure (unemployment benefits) with respect to output have been traditionally calculated by the OECD to estimate the sensitivity of these variables to the cycle. The method is described in Van den Noord, P. (2000) and updated in Girouard and André (2005). Through a regression analysis the output gap and the elasticities are used to derive the effect on taxes and expenditure arising from the economy's cycles. Combining these estimates one can construct the cyclically adjusted budget balance (CAB) indicator, extensively used by the European Commission in order to measure the sustainability of fiscal policy of its member states, i.e. a fall in the primary CAB is interpreted as a sign of expansionary policy, a rise as an indication of a contractionary fiscal policy (European Commission, 2004). Empirical articles can either estimate elasticities through econometric methods or use these elasticities calculated by OECD in order to measure the sensitivity of expenditure and revenues separately[21].

Our experiment constitutes a mere graphical analysis instead. First, we calculate a simple elasticity of government revenues with respect to GDP at current prices (erevgdp), which measures the contribution of a change of one percentage of output to budget revenues, i.e., the degree of connection between economic growth and government revenues. Subsequently, we graphic them with respect the budget revenues growth (growth_rev).

In order to calculate the elasticities for the Eurozone countries we use quarterly data based on government statistics that have been drawn from Eurostat. The period covers 2001Q1-2007Q4, a boom period just before the crisis and when all the eight countries we study (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Spain) already belonged to the Eurozone[22].

We have also calculated the elasticities of current government expenditures, but the graphics are not presented for space reasons. We find that according to their elasticities, Eurozone countries can be split into two groups (A and B). Countries in Group B (Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Spain) present the higher positive government expenditures elasticities, but as we are not interested in achieving balance budget through reducing government spending which would mean cutting welfare measures, this variable is not a subject of analysis.

[21] Bayoumi (1995) estimates the sensitivity of expenditure and revenues separately by ordinary least squares. She shows how in the U.S. the cyclical responsiveness of state budget is significantly affected by fiscal restraints. She also extents the analysis to some European industrial countries such as Germany, France or Netherlands, considering the Maastricht Treaty on Economic and Monetary Union as restraints which significantly diminish the stabilization afforded by national budgets. Eichengreen and Wyplosz (1999) use both OECD and Bayoumi (1995)'s elasticities to review the reasons that have been encouraged the Stability and Growth Pact. One of these was the systemic risk of bank crisis owing to government's failure to service its debt. More recently, Eller (2009) uses the European Commission's elasticities to show that in the EU member states in Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe, budgetary positions react less strongly to GDP changes than in the euro area.

[22] Greece became the twelfth EU Member State to adopt the single currency 1st January of 2001.

Instead, we focus our analysis on revenues budget. The analysis has been completed for all the Eurozone countries with the same results and is available upon request. We will observe that, not only the magnitude of the elasticity matters, but also the position that each observation takes into the quadrants in Figure 2 (it displays the relationship between the elasticity of revenues with respect to GDP and revenues growth) is important. Figure 2 in Annex II shows the graphics of two groups of countries: group A comprises three countries (Austria, France and Germany) with debt-GDP ratios under 100 percentage points in 2011Q4 together with Belgium, which exceeded this limit in 2012; while group B comprises three countries (Greece, Ireland and Portugal) with debt-GDP ratios over 100 percentage points together with Spain which, even though its debt-GDP ratio is similar to those in group A, suffers major credit problems as a result of the collapse of its banking sector and high levels of unemployment[23] The "x" axis corresponds to the revenues elasticity and the "y" axis to tax revenues growth. We interpret the graphics in function of their quadrants, the four sections into which the x-y plane is divided by the "x" and "y" axes. Observations in quadrant I with a positive elasticity and positive growth of revenues mean a positive growth of GDP. Conversely, observations in quadrant II with a negative elasticity and positive growth of revenues imply a decreasing GDP (so, it is expected that few observations yield into this quadrant). Likewise, we expect few observations in quadrant III, because revenues are descending when GDP is increasing as revenues elasticity is negative. Finally, quadrant IV show a positive connection between product and revenues, both are into downwards trends because elasticity is positive and revenues growth is negative. It is expected that countries with a negative or low positive degree of connection would present the worst debt problems.

Greece for instance, shows low positive elasticities coinciding with rising revenues (the highest value does not reach 2.5) during all the period with only one exception: 2001Q4 (38.08). The same pattern is repeated in Portugal where the highest positive value of the elasticity is 13.88. Portugal is also the country with the highest negative elasticity located in quadrant III (-434.46 in 2002Q3), but this observation was eliminated to facilitate the understanding of the Figures. Ireland would be the exception since the highest positive value of its revenue elasticity is 25.58, however its notable presence in both quadrant III and IV has undermined its fiscal revenues. Spain is in a delicate situation, even though its size is higher than that of the other countries in group B and according to the "too big to fail" theory this fact might preserve this country from excessive turbulent speculative attacks, it should increase its positive revenue's elasticity to levels close to those registered by countries which conform Group A. Observations that correspond to Austria, Germany and France are predominantly situated into quadrant I, and the highest values of their

[23] See the Eurostat report of debt-GDP ratio at http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/2-23072012-AP/EN/2- 23072012-AP-EN.PDF.

revenues elasticity are of 37.18, 54.26 and 18.55, respectively. Even Austria is able to increase revenues while GDP is decreasing. The exception is Belgium with a revenue elasticity which does not reach the value of 8, which might explain why this country registers the biggest debt-GDP ratio in Group A. It is worthy to remark that this is the main difference between France and Belgium taken into account that revenue elasticity does not register negative values in both countries.

In order to calculate the elasticities in Ecuador, we employ the same monthly data (converted to quarterly revenues) used in the CVAR models described above. We employ an initial elasticity for total revenue including oil revenue (etotalrevgdp) and a second for tax revenue (erevgdp) only. In the case of Ecuador, Figure 3 illustrates that the relationship between revenues and output is poor (the majority of the observations are below the value of 5). Besides, it is worrisome those observations into quadrant III which represent negative revenue elasticity: revenues are decreasing while GDP is increasing.

Finally, Figure 4 and Figure 5 present the relationship between tax revenues growth and expenditure growth in the eight European countries we have studied and Ecuador, respectively, whilst Figures 6 and 7 display the relationships between debt- GDP ratios with deficit-GDP ratios in the above-mentioned Eurozone countries.

Regarding countries of group B, Greece records the highest debt-GDP ratio before and after 2007. Ireland has the second highest debt-GDP ratio reaching 100 percentage points. It is worth noting that Ireland has greater deficits but lower debt than Greece. It is comprehensive since, unlike Greece, it presents large periods with positive elasticity of revenues with respect to GDP, which allowed several surplus episodes before the crisis. Spain also accumulated surplus but recall that it presents a persistent low positive elasticity of revenues with respect to GDP.

The above analysis can also be applied to the Ecuadorian economy. First, Ecuador does not present high positive elasticity of tax revenues with respect to GDP and second, its positive relationship between tax revenues and expenditures (see Figure 5) implies that Ecuador does not have enough sources of revenues to cover overall government spending. Unfortunately, Ecuador is following the same path as those countries in Group B above. Ecuador needs to diversify both its economy and tax system in order to strength the connection between the two and so as to face any future fiscal crises.

6. Conclusions

This article seeks to clarify whether fiscal sustainability is possible in Ecuador taking into account that it is a dollarized country and one that is strongly dependent on oil revenues, which are particularly volatile because of price fluctuations. We estimate a cointegrated VAR using the variables that fulfil the intertemporal budget constraint and confirm previous findings that characterize Ecuadorian government expenditure in terms of its inertia and heavy dependence on oil revenues. We verify that Ecuador does not have a debt problem as the debt-GDP ratio can be excluded from the cointegration relation. We show that the debt-GDP ratio falls as long as government spending rises; therefore, we conclude that government expenditure is not tied to debt. In addition, this allows the Ecuadorian government to keep expenditure high as it does not increase the debt-GDP ratio.

However, it would seem that given its non-diversified economy, Ecuador is vulnerable to future debt problems. If we analyse the evolution of total government expenditure of the Eurozone countries and their revenue behaviour since they became part of the EMU, it seems that Ecuador might be likely to suffer similar debt problems in the future. From calculations of the quarterly elasticity of tax revenues with respect to GDP, it can be seen that countries with high elasticities are the ones with the smallest debt problems today. However, Ecuador presents patterns of behaviour that are very similar to those presented by Eurozone economies with low tax revenues elasticities. But by diversifying its economy, and by basing it on a lasting, renewable sector, this elasticity should be raised, and eventually fiscal sustainability will depend on these stable, more profitable sectors.

The fact that Ecuador is a dollarized country means that it has relinquished control over both its interest rates and exchange rates, the latter being fundamental in failing sectors other than the oil sector. As such, Ecuador needs to rethink its exchange rate regime, before dollarization becomes counter-productive to budgetary positions. Whether a monetary union is among the alternatives open to Ecuador, it is our belief that within the framework of such a union the convergence of tax revenues elasticities might be a key factor in achieving successfully this exchange rate regime, so as to avoid any “non-odious and legitimate” debt crises that might end up being restructured.

References

Almeida, Mª D., Gallardo, V. and Tomaselli, A. (2006). "Gobernabilidad fiscal en Ecuador". CEPAL Serie Nº 57. United Nations Press, ISBN: 92-1-322905-4.

Alvarado, C., Izquierdo, A. and Panizza, U. (2004). "Fiscal Sustainability in Emerging Market Countries with an Application to Ecuador". Inter-American Development Bank. Research Department. Working Paper #511.

Barnhill, T., and G. Kopits (2003). "Assessing Fiscal Sustainability under Uncertainty." IMF Working Paper 03/79. Washington, DC, United States: International Monetary Fund.

Barro, R. M. (1986). "U.S. Deficits Since World War I", Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 88, No. 1, 195-222.

Barro, R. M. (1979). "On the Determination of Public Debt", Journal of Political Economy, 87, 940–947.

Bayoumi and Eichengreen (1995). "Restraining yourself: the implications of fiscal rules for economic stabilization ". International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.

Baxter, M. and King, R. (1993). "Fiscal Policy in General Equilibrium" The American Economic Review, Vol. 83, No. 3 (Jun., 1993), pp. 315-334.

Blanchard, O. & Perotti, R. (2002). "An Empirical Characterization Of The Dynamic Effects Of Changes In Government Spending And Taxes On Output,"The Quarterly Journal of Economics, MIT Press, vol. 117(4), pages 1329-1368, November.

Bohn, H. (2007). "Are stationarity and cointegration restrictions really necessary for the intertemporal budget constraint?,"Journal of Monetary Economics, Elsevier, vol. 54(7), pages 1837-1847, October.

Bohn, H. (2005). "The sustainability of fiscal policy in the United States". CESifo Working Papers, No. 1446, http://hdl.handle.net/10419/18810

Bohn, H. (1998). "The Behaviour of U.S. public debt and deficits", Quarterly Journal of Economics, 113, 949-963.

Burnside, Craig & Eichenbaum, Martin & Fisher, Jonas D. M. (2004). "Fiscal shocks and their consequences,"Journal of Economic Theory, Elsevier, vol. 115(1), pages 89-117, March.

Caldara, D. & Kamps, Ch. (2008). "What are the effects of fiscal shocks? A VAR-based comparative analysis,"Working Paper Series 877, European Central Bank.

Collignon, S. (2012) "Fiscal Policy Rules and the sustainability of public debt in Europe". International Economic Review Volume 53, Issue 2, pages 539–567, May 2012.

Correa, R. (2005). “Canje de Deuda: Todo en Función de los Acreedores”, LA INSIGNIA, June 20, 2005, available at http://www.lainsignia.org/2005/junio/econ_008.htm.

Cueva, S. (2008) “Ecuador: Fiscal Stabilization Funds and Prospects”. Inter-American Development Bank. Country Department Andean Group (CAN). Working Paper CSI-110. EC-P1059.

Das, U., Papaioannou,M. and Trebesch, Ch. (2012). “Sovereign Debt Restructurings 1950–2010: Literature Survey, Data, and Stylized Facts”. FMI WP/12/203.

Díaz-Cassou, J., Erce-Domínguez, A. and Vázquez-Zamora, Juan (2008). “Recent episodes of sovereign debt restructurings. A case study approach” . Documentos Ocasionales. N.º 0804. Banco de España.

Eichengreen, B. and Wyplosz (1998) “The Stability Pact: More Than a Minor Nuisance?”. Economic Policy Volume 13, Issue 26, pages 65–113, April 1998

Eller M. (2009). “Fiscal position and Size of Automatic Stabilizers in the CESEE EU member states. Implications for discretionary measures”. Austrian Central Bank, Focus on European Economic Integration Q2/2009, Issue 2, pages 78-84.

Engle, R. F. and C. W. J. Granger (1987). Cointegration and error correction: Representation, estimation, and testing. Econometrica, 55(2), 251–276.

European Commission. 2004. Public Finances in EMU – 2004. European Economy No. 3. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/publication469_en.pdf

Favero, C., Giavazzi, F. and Perego, J. (2011). "Country Heterogeneity and the International Evidence on the Effects of Fiscal Policy,"IMF Economic Review, Palgrave Macmillan, vol. 59(4), pages 652-682, November.

Favero, C., Giavazzi, F. (2007). "Debt and the Effects of Fiscal Policy,"NBER Working Papers 12822, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Feibelman, A. (2010). “Ecuador’s Sovereign Default: A Pyrrhic Victory for Odious Debt?”. Journal of International Banking Law and Regulation (UK). Volume/Issue: 25-7 (2010), pp. 357-62.

Fincke, B. and A. Greiner (2012). How to assess debt sustainability? Some theory and empirical evidence for selected euro area countries. Applied Economics 44 (28), pp. 3717-3724.

Girouard, N. and C. André (2005) Measuring cyclically-adjusted budget balances for OECD countries, OECD Economics Department Working Paper No. 434.

Hoover, K., Johansen, S. and Juselius, K. (2007) "Allowing the data to speak freely: The macroeconometrics of the cointegrated vector autoregression. American Economic Review 98, pp. 251-55.

Johansen, S. (1996). “Likelihood-Based Inference in Cointegrated Vector Autoregressive Models”, 2.edn. Advanced Texts in Econometrics, Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Johansen, S. and K. Juselius (1992). “Testing structural hypotheses in a multivariate cointegration analysis of the PPP and the UIP for UK”. Journal of Econometrics 53, 211–244.

Johansen, S. and K. Juselius (1990). “Maximum likelihood estimation and inference on cointegration with application to the demand of money”. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 52(2), 169–210.

Juselius, K. (2009.) “Special Issue on Using Econometrics for Assessing Economic Models-An Introduction”. Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal, Vol. 3, 2009-28.

Juselius, K (2006). “The Cointegrated VAR Model: Methodology and Applications”, 1st edn, Oxford University Press, USA.

Kia, A. (2008). “Fiscal sustainability in emerging countries: Evidence from Iran and Turkey”. Journal of Policy Modeling. Vol. 30, issue 6, pages 957-972.

López-Cálix, J. (2003). “Maintaining Stability with Fiscal Discipline and Competitiveness.” In: V. Fretes-Cibilis, M. Giugale and J. López-Cálix, editors. Ecuador: An Economic and Social Agenda for the New Millennium. Washington, DC, United States: World Bank.

Marí, M. L. and Gómez-Puig, M (2013). “Pass-through in dollarized countries: should Ecuador abandon the U.S. Dollar?”. Applied Economics, forthcoming.

Mejía, A., Albornoz, V. and Araujo, M. (2007) “The Political Economy of the Budget Process: The Case of Ecuador”. Inter-American Development Bank. Regional Operations Department 3 (RE3). Country Studies Series Working Paper CS-101.

Moodys (2009). “Sovereign default and recovery rates, 1983-2008”. Moody’s global credit policy.

Mountford, A. and Uhlig, H. (2009). “What are the effects of fiscal policy shocks?”. Journal of Applied Econometrics, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., vol. 24(6), pages 960-992.

Palley, Th. (2004). “The Economics of Exchange Rates and the Dollarization Debate”. Int’l. Journal of Political Economy, vol. 33, no. 1, Spring 2003, pp. 61–82.

Perotti, R. (2008). "In Search of the Transmission Mechanism of Fiscal Policy,"NBER Chapters, in: NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2007, Volume 22, pages 169-226 National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Perotti, R. (2002). "Estimating the effects of fiscal policy in OECD countries". European Central Bank Working Papers Series Nº 168.

Quispe-Agnoli, M. and Whisler, E. (2006). “Official Dollarization and the Banking System in Ecuador and El Salvador”. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. Economic Review. Third Quarter 2006.

Ramey, V. (2011). "Identifying Government Spending Shocks: It's all in the Timing,"The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Oxford University Press, vol. 126(1), pages 1-50.

Ray, R. and Kozameh, S. (2012). “Ecuador’s Economy Since 2007”. Center for Economic and policy research. (http://www.cepr.net/index.php/publications/)

Romer Ch. and Romer, D. (2010) “The Macroeconomic Effects of Tax Changes: Estimates Based on a New Measure of Fiscal Shocks”. American Economic Review 100 (June 2010): 763–801.

Salmon, F. (2009). “Lessons from Ecuador’s Bond Default”. Reuters article. May 29, 2009. Available at: http://blogs.reuters.com/felix-salmon/2009/05/29/lessons-from-ecuadors-bond-default/.

Sandoval, L. and Weisbrot, M. (2009). “Update on the Ecuadorian Economy”. Center for Economic and policy research (http://www.cepr.net/index.php/publications/reports/)

The World Bank (2005). “Creating Fiscal Space for Poverty Reduction in Ecuador. A Fiscal Management and Public Expenditure Review”. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. World Bank Publications. ISBN-10 / ASIN: 0821362569.

Tinsley, E. (2003). “Debt Administration and Sustainability.” In: V. Fretes-Cibilis, M. Giugales and J. López-Cálix, editors. Ecuador: An Economic and Social Agenda for the New Millennium. Washington, DC, United States: World Bank.

Van den Noord, P. (2000), “The Size and Role of Automatic Fiscal Stabilizers in the 1990s and Beyond”

OECD Economics Department Working Papers, No. 230, Paris.

Annex I. Econometric Model: Cointegrated VAR

Following Engle and Granger (1987), Johansen and Juselius (1990; 1992) extend the VAR model by applying the concepts of cointegration and error correction to analyse long run relations among non-stationary variables. This extension is referred to as cointegrated VAR.

Consider the *p*- dimensional VAR (*k*):

$$X_t = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \prod_i X_{t-i} + \phi D_t + e_t \tag{1}$$

Where X_t is a p*1 vector of endogenous variables with t=1,2..T; $\prod_i$ is p*p matrices of parameters to be estimated with i=1,2…k; D_t is a vector of deterministic terms as a constant, trend or dummy variables. Finally, e_t is a p*1 vector of error terms which follow a Gaussian distribution: e_t ~ iid with N(0,Ω). The residual covariance matrix (Ω) is a p*p matrix containing the information about contemporaneous effects. And *k* is the number of lags necessary to have an appropriate model (no autocorrelation, no ARCH effects and normalized errors).

This *p*- dimensional VAR (*k*) can be re-written in the Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) form:

$$\Delta X_t = \Pi X_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \Gamma_i \Delta X_{t-i} + \Phi D_t + e_t \tag{2}$$

Where,

$\Pi = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \prod_i - I_p$ represents the long run effects and $\Gamma_i = -\sum_{j=i+1}^{k} \prod_j$ the short run effects, with i= 1, …,k-1 and e_t ~ iid N(0,Ω).

We have that ΔX_t and ΔX_{t-i} are stationary because they perform first difference processes to get rid of the just one unit root that the level variables contain. Since a stationary process cannot be equal to a non-stationary process, the estimation results can only make sense if $\prod_i$ defines stationary linear combinations of the variables (Juselius, 2006). $\prod_i$ can be written $\prod_i$ = αβ', where α and β'are p*r matrices, r ≤ p. Thus, under the I(1) hypothesis, the cointegrated VAR model is given by:

$$\Delta X_t = \Gamma_1 \Delta X_{t-1} + \ldots + \Gamma_{k-1} \Delta X_{t-k+1} + \alpha\beta' X_{t-1} + \Phi D_t + e_t \qquad (3)$$

where $\beta' X_{t-1}$ is an r*1 vector of stationary cointegration relations. Under the hypothesis that $X_t \sim I(1)$ all stochastic components are stationary in model (3) and the system is now logically consistent.

Cointegration exists when two or more variables share common stochastic and deterministic trends, they move together in the long run, and therefore they can be interpreted as long-run economic steady-state relations.

$\beta' X_{t-1} = \beta_0$ describes a system in equilibrium where there is no economic adjustment force to change the system to a new position. When exogenous shocks affect the system, and $\beta' X_{t-1} - \beta_0 \neq 0$, the adjustment term α , pull the process back towards the long run equilibrium. If r=1 there is a unique stationary relation. If r>1 only the cointegration space $\prod_i$ = αβ', and not the cointegration parameters (α and β), is estimated consistently. We have to resolve an identification problem.

The VECM expressed as a function of the innovations of the system shows which common stochastic trends are responsible for the non-stationarity of the process.

$$X_t = C \sum_{i=1}^{t} (e_i + \Phi D_i) + C^*(L)(e_t + \Phi D_t) + X_0 \qquad t=1,2,\ldots,T$$

Where: $C = \beta_\perp (\alpha'_\perp \Gamma \beta_\perp)^{-1} \alpha'_\perp$ or $C = \beta^*_\perp \alpha'_\perp$

Where: $\beta^*_\perp = \beta_\perp (\alpha'_\perp \Gamma \beta_\perp)^{-1}$

The idea is to determine which variables are simply adjusting to a long run equilibrium equation i.e. significant alphas (α) in order to identify which ones are simply pushing the system (insignificant alphas, therefore can be zero in the VECM).

Knowing that $\alpha'_\perp \alpha = 0$, a zero row in alpha corresponds to a unit vector in $\alpha_\perp$, we say that this variable is long-run weakly exogenous implying that its cumulated residuals can be considered a common stochastic trend, then $\alpha'_{\perp}\sum_{i=1}^{t} e_i$ is understood as an estimation of the p - r common stochastic trends.

This does not imply that the variable itself is a common trend. For this we need the rows of the Γ_i matrices associated with the weakly exogenous variable to be zero. Given $X_t \sim I(1)$ this is essentially the condition of strong exogeneity, under which the equation for a strongly exogenous variable $X_{j,t}$ becomes $\Delta x_{j,t} = e_{j,t}$, in this case $x_{j,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{t} e_{j,i}$: the common stochastic trend coincides with the variable itself, and then, $x_{j,t}$ will have a unit row vector in the C matrix. Similar to α and β, we can transform $\beta^{*}_{\perp}$ and $\alpha'_{\perp}$ by a non-singular (p-r)*(p-r) matrix Q without changing the value of the likelihood function:

$$C^{c} = \beta^{*}_{\perp} Q Q^{-1} \alpha'_{\perp} = \beta^{*c}_{\perp}(\alpha^{c}_{\perp})'$$

Additional restrictions on $\beta^{*}_{\perp}$ and $\alpha_{\perp}$ do constrain the likelihood function making possible the over identifying restrictions on $\alpha_{\perp}$ and $\beta_{\perp}$ which can be expressed as testable restrictions on α and β. In our case, with r=2 and $X'_t = [g_t, t_t, y_t, d_{t-1}]$ we test the weak exogeneity of debt level and economic activity in the following manner:

$$\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} * & * \\ * & * \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \qquad \alpha_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

With a C matrix:

$$C^{c} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & * & * \end{bmatrix}$$

Even when the unrestricted C matrix gives very useful information about the effects of the stochastic driving forces in the VECM, and the restricted C^c can be used to check the robustness of the analysis, the challenge is to recover the structural shocks in order to interpret the results empirically[24]. This means that we have to obtain the empirical shocks from a structural MA model, i.e. the structural C^c matrix[25].

By premultiplying (2) with a non-singular p*p matrix B we obtain the VECM with simultaneous effect:

$$B\Delta X_t = B_1 \Delta X_{t-1} + b\beta' X_{t-1} + B\,\Phi D_t + u_t$$

Where $B_1 = B\Gamma_1$, $b = B\alpha$ and $u_t = Be_t$.

The B matrix defines how the structural shocks u_t are associated with the VECM residuals[27].

The structural MA representation of the CVAR:

$$X_t = C^{\sim} \sum_{i=1}^{t} u_i + C^{*\sim} u_t + X_0$$

Where $C^{\sim} = C\,B^{-1}$ and $C^{*\sim} = C^{*}(L)B^{-1}$

---

[24] A column of insignificant coefficients means that the empirical shocks of the corresponding variable have only temporary effects on the variables of the system, while a column of significant coefficients means permanent effects. The rows in C matrix inform us about the weights with which each variable is influenced by any of the cumulated empirical shocks.

[25] Juselius (2006) points out that omitted relevant variables generate correlated *p* residuals in VAR, a feature that is not assumed to be present in the structural VAR model, where the orthogonality of structural VAR errors is based on an assumption that the model contains all the relevant variables. This is the main reason why the labelling of empirical residuals as structural shocks is often misleading.

[27] We can find a B matrix to fulfil the following assumptions: (i) A distinction between r transitory and p − r permanent shocks is made, i.e.
$u_t = (u_s, u_p)$; (ii) The transitory shocks have no long-run impact on the variables of the system whereas the permanent shocks have such effects on
at least one variable in the system and (iii) $E(u_t u_t') = I_P$, i.e. all 'structural' shocks are linearly independent.

Annex II. Figures

Fig.1. Total government expenditures and Debt/GDP ratio in Ecuador.



Source: Central Bank of Ecuador and own estimates. The government expenditures include interest payments.

Fig. 2. Relationship between the elasticity of revenues respect GDP and revenues growth of Eurozone countries.

Group A



Group B



Source: Eurostat

Fig. 3 Relationship between revenue's elasticities respect GDP and revenues growth of Ecuador



Source: Central Bank of Ecuador

Fig. 4. Relationship between revenues growth expenditure growth in Eurozone countries.



Source: Eurostat

Fig. 5. Relationship between tax revenues growth and expenditure growth in Ecuador.



Sources: Central Bank of Ecuador

Fig. 6 Relationship between Debt/GDP and Deficit/GDP in Eurozone countries during the period 2001-2006.

Group A **Group B**



Source: Eurostat

Fig. 7. Relationship between Debt/GDP and Deficit/GDP in Eurozone countries during the period 2007-2011.

Group A **Group B**



Source: Eurostat

Annex III. Empirical Results

Table. 1 Results of the I (1) analysis for the first model.

With permanent and seasonal dummies								Excluding all sort of dummies							
p-r	R	Eig.. Value	Trace	Trace*	Frac95	p	p*	p-r	r	Eig. Value	Trace	Trace*	Frac95	p	p*
4	0	0.273	82.67	78.18	63.659	0.000	0.002	4	0	0.301	92.2	87.68	63.659	0.000	0.000
3	1	0.131	35.85	34.09	42.770	0.214	0.289	3	1	0.137	39.7	38.11	42.770	0.100	0.140
2	2	0.064	15.28	14.24	25.731	0.558	0.642	2	2	0.067	18.1	17.47	25.731	0.343	0.388
1	3	0.037	5.613	4.521	12.448	0.521	0.670	1	3	0.053	7.95	7.491	12.448	0.263	0.305

(*) Corresponds to the Bartlett corrected trace test.

Table. 2 Results of testing restrictions on beta and alpha for the first model.

Test of exclusion (restrictions on beta)								Test of weak exogeneity (restrictions on alpha)						
r	DGF	5% C.V.	lexp	lrev	leai	Ldebt_ gdp	trend	r	DGF	5% C.V.	lexp	Lrev	leai	Ldebt_ gdp
1	1	3.84	15.709 [0.000]	26.062 [0.000]	10.856 [0.001]	3.107 [0.078]	0.031 [0.86]	1	1	3.84	0.235 [0.628]	20.248 [0.000]	3.200 [0.074]	0.996 [0.318]
2	2	5.99	22.961 [0.000]	33.603 [0.000]	17.227 [0.000]	5.488 [0.064]	8.688 [0.013]	2	2	5.99	4.450 [0.108]	28.577 [0.000]	8.460 [0.015]	8.137 [0.017]
3	3	7.81	24.054 [0.000]	37.598 [0.000]	19.969 [0.000]	6.194 [0.103]	12.261 [0.007]	3	3	7.81	4.628 [0.201]	31.513 [0.000]	12.350 [0.006]	11.563 [0.009]

LR test, Chi-square(r), p-values in brackets.

Table. 3 Results of the I (1) analysis for the second model.

With permanent and seasonal dummies								Excluding all sort of dummies							
p-r	r	Eig.. Value	Trace	Trace*	Frac95	p	p*	p-r	r	Eig. Value	Trace	Trace*	Frac95	p	p*
4	0	0.308	96.99	92.07	63.659	0.000	0.002	4	0	0.341	113.17	108.456	63.659	0.000	0.000
3	1	0.152	42.89	41.50	42.770	0.049	0.067	3	1	0.166	51.862	50.389	42.770	0.004	0.006
2	2	0.088	18.58	17.54	25.731	0.312	0.383	2	2	0.105	25.213	24.035	25.731	0.058	0.082
1	3	0.034	5.018	4.733	12.448	0.601	0.640	1	3	0.059	8.872	8.484	12.448	0.193	0.221

(*) Corresponds to the Bartlett corrected trace test.

Table. 4 Results of testing restrictions on beta and alpha for the second model.

Test of exclusion (restrictions on beta)								Test of weak exogeneity (restrictions on alpha)						
r	DGF	5% C.V.	lrev	lgov	leai	lorev	trend	r	DGF	5% C.V.	lrev	Lgov	leai	lorev
1	1	3.84	28.177 [0.000]	25.457 [0.000]	15.384 [0.000]	11.085 [0.001]	0.030 [0.863]	1	1	3.84	13.057 [0.000]	4.017 [0.045]	5.300 [0.021]	3.152 [0.076]
2	2	5.99	38.515 [0.000]	35.433 [0.000]	15.402 [0.000]	20.339 [0.000]	1.898 [0.387]	2	2	5.99	22.829 [0.000]	14.217 [0.001]	6.111 [0.047]	5.504 [0.064]
3	3	7.81	46.776 [0.000]	38.276 [0.000]	22.590 [0.000]	26.470 [0.000]	9.734 [0.021]	3	3	7.81	31.320 [0.000]	15.881 [0.001]	13.060 [0.005]	8.685 [0.034]

Table 5. Residual S.E. and Cross- Correlations for the second model

	lrev	lgov	leai	lorev
Residual S.E.	0.02922825	0.05619247	0.02272652	0.12829084
Lrev	1.000			
Lgov	0.883	1.000		
Leai	0.708	0.294	1.000	
lorev	0.959	0.980	0.478	1.000

Fig. 7 The impulse response functions for the two permanent shocks and transitory shocks.



Table 6 Impact after 23 periods

	Trans(1)	Trans(2)	Perm(1)	Perm(2)
LREV	0.034	0.023	2.054	2.037
LGOV	0.034	0.021	1.637	5.348
LEAI	0.007	0.004	2.270	-0.007
LOREV	-0.040	-0.028	6.156	11.295

Table 7 B normalized matrix [U(t)=B*EPS(t)]

	EPS(1)	EPS(2)	EPS(3)	EPS(4)
Trans(1)	1.000	0.069	-0.437	-0.046
Trans(2)	-0.388	1.000	0.707	-0.232
Perm(1)	0.103	-0.110	1.000	0.135
Perm(2)	0.233	-0.961	1.000	-0.381

Llista Document de Treball

List Working Paper

WP 2013/06 "Fiscal sustainability and fiscal shocks in a dollarized and oil-exporting country: Ecuador" Marí Del Cristo, L.M. and Gómez-Puig, M.

WP 2013/05 "Informality and Overeducation in the Labor Market of a Developing Country" Herrera-Idárraga, P.; López-Bazo, E. and Motellón, E.

WP 2013/04 "GLS based unit root tests for bounded processes" Carrion-i-Silvestre, J.Ll. and Gadea, M.D.

WP 2013/03 "Determinants of Broadband Access: Is Platform Competition always the Key Variable to Success?" Fageda, X.; Rubio, R. and Termes, M.

WP 2013/02 "Beyond Value-at-Risk: GlueVaR Distortion Risk Measures" Belles-Sampera, J.; Guillén, M. and Santolino, M.

WP 2013/01 "How systemic is Spain for Europe?" Claeys, P. and Vašícek, B.

WP 2012/24 "Changes in Wage Structure in Mexico Going Beyond the Mean: An Analysis of Differences in Distribution, 1987-2008" Tello, C.; Ramos, R, and Artís, M.

WP 2012/23 "Decomposing the Rural-Urban Differential in Student Achievement in Colombia Using PISA Microdata" Ramos, R.; Duque, J.C. and Nieto, S.

WP 2012/22 "Recovery Risk and Labor Costs in Public-Private-Partnerships: Contractual Choice in the U.S. Water industry" Albalate, D, Bel, G. and Geddes, R.

WP 2012/21 "Beyond pure public and pure private management models: Mixed firms in the European Airport Industry" Albalate, D.; Bel, G. and Fageda, X.

WP 2012/20 "The determinants of contractual choice for private involvement in infrastructure projects in the United States" Albalate, D, Bel, G. and Geddes, R.

WP 2012/19 "Measuring Sovereign Bond Spillover in Europe and the Impact of Rating News" Claeys, P. and Vašíček, B.

WP 2012/18 "Entry Regulation Asymmetries and Gasoline Competition in a Mixed Motorway Network" Albalate, D. and Perdiguero, J.

WP 2012/17 "Regulation of Port Charges in Spain: Global versus Local Competition" Fageda, X. and Gonzalez-Aregall, M.

WP 2012/16 "Pass-through in dollarized countries: should Ecuador abandon the U.S. Dollar?" Marí del Cristo, M.L. and Gómez-Puig, M.

WP 2012/15 "A Note on the Relationship Between the Cyclicality of Markups and Fiscal Policy" Claeys, P. and Costa, L.F.

WP 2012/14 "Do intra- and inter-industry spillovers matter? CDM model estimates for Spain" Goya, E.; Vayá, E and Suriñach, J.

WP 2012/13 "What Drives the Choice of Partners in R&D Cooperation? Heterogeneity across Sectors" Badillo, E. and Moreno, R.

WP 2012/12 "Corruption and local politics: does it pay to be a crook?" Jiménez, J.L. and García, C.

WP 2012/11 "Not always sunny in paradise: prices and brand diversity in touristic areas supermarkets" Campos, J.; Jiménez, J.L. and Suárez-Alemán, A.

WP 2012/10 "The institutional, economic and social determinants of local government transparency" Albalate, D.

WP 2012/09 "The business excellence attraction composite index (BEACI). Design and apllication to the municipalities of the Barcelona province" Murillo, J.; Romaní, J.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2012/08 "Policy options for the promotion of electric vehicles: a review" Perdiguero, J. and Jiménez, J.L.

WP 2012/07 "Price differences between domestic and international air markets: an empirical application to routes from Gran Canaria" Fageda, X.; Jiménez, J.L. and Díaz Santamaría, C.

WP 2012/06 "Building a "quality in work" index in Spain" López-Tamayo, J.; Royuela, V. and Suriñach, J.

WP 2012/05 "Mergers and difference-in-difference estimator: why firms do not increase prices?" Jiménez, J.L. and Perdiguero, J.

WP 2012/04 "What attracts knowledge workers? The role of space, social connections, institutions, jobs and amenities" Miguélez, E. and Moreno, R.

WP 2012/03 "What Drives the Urban Wage Premium? Evidence along the Wage Distribution" Matano, A. and Naticchioni, P.

WP 2012/02 "Location Patterns of Creative Capital and Regional Disparities in Spain" Kerimoglu, E. and Karahasan, B.C.

WP 2012/01 "The connection between distortion risk measures and ordered weighted averaging operators" Belles-Sampera, J.; Merigó, J.M.; Guillén, M. and Santolino, M.

WP 2011/26 "Productivity and innovation spillovers: Micro evidence from Spain" Goya, E.; Vayá, E. and Suriñach, J.

WP 2011/25 "The regional distribution of unemployment. What do micro-data tell us?" López-Bazo, E. and Motellón, E.

WP 2011/24 "Vertical relations and local competition: an empirical approach" Perdiguero, J.

WP 2011/23 "Air services on thin routes: Regional versus low-cost airlines" Fageda, X. and Flores-Fillol, R.

WP 2011/22 "Measuring early childhood health: a composite index comparing Colombian departments" Osorio, A.M.; Bolancé, C. and Alcañiz, M.

WP 2011/21 "A relational approach to the geography of innovation: a typology of regions" Moreno, R. and Miguélez, E.

WP 2011/20 "Does Rigidity of Prices Hide Collusion?" Jiménez, J.L and Perdiguero, J.

WP 2011/19 "Factors affecting hospital admission and recovery stay duration of in-patient motor victims in Spain" Santolino, M.; Bolancé, C. and Alcañiz, M.

WP 2011/18 "Why do municipalities cooperate to provide local public services? An empirical analysis" Bel, G.; Fageda, X. and Mur, M.

WP 2011/17 "The "farthest" need the best. Human capital composition and development-specific economic growth" Manca, F.

WP 2011/16 "Causality and contagion in peripheral EMU public debt markets: a dynamic approach" Gómez-Puig, M. and Sosvilla-Rivero, S.

WP 2011/15 "The influence of decision-maker effort and case complexity on appealed rulings subject to multi-categorical selection" Santolino, M. and Söderberg, M.

WP 2011/14 "Agglomeration, Inequality and Economic Growth" Castells, D. and Royuela, V.

WP 2011/13 "A correlation sensitivity analysis of non-life underwriting risk in solvency capital requirement estimation" Bermúdez, L.; Ferri, A. and Guillén, M.

WP 2011/12 "Assessing agglomeration economies in a spatial framework with endogenous regressors" Artis, M.J.; Miguélez, E. and Moreno, R.

WP 2011/11 "Privatization, cooperation and costs of solid waste services in small towns" Bel, G; Fageda, X. and Mur, M.

WP 2011/10 "Privatization and PPPS in transportation infrastructure: Network effects of increasing user fees" Albalate, D. and Bel, G.

WP 2011/09 "Debating as a classroom tool for adapting learning outcomes to the European higher education area" Jiménez, J.L.; Perdiguero, J. and Suárez, A.

WP 2011/08 "Influence of the claimant's behavioural features on motor compensation outcomes" Ayuso, M; Bermúdez L. and Santolino, M.

WP 2011/07 "Geography of talent and regional differences in Spain" Karahasan, B.C. and Kerimoglu E.

WP 2011/06 "How Important to a City Are Tourists and Daytrippers? The Economic Impact of Tourism on The City of Barcelona" Murillo, J; Vayá, E; Romaní, J. and Suriñach, J.

WP 2011/05 "Singling out individual inventors from patent data" Miguélez,E. and Gómez-Miguélez, I.

WP 2011/04 "¿La sobreeducación de los padres afecta al rendimiento académico de sus hijos?" Nieto, S; Ramos, R.

WP 2011/03 "The Transatlantic Productivity Gap: Is R&D the Main Culprit?" Ortega-Argilés, R.; Piva, M.; and Vivarelli, M.

WP 2011/02 "The Spatial Distribution of Human Capital: Can It Really Be Explained by Regional Differences in Market Access?" Karahasan, B.C. and López-Bazo, E

WP 2011/01 "I If you want me to stay, pay" . Claeys, P and Martire, F

WP 2010/16 "Infrastructure and nation building: The regulation and financing of network transportation infrastructures in Spain (1720-2010)"Bel,G

WP 2010/15 "Fiscal policy and economic stability: does PIGS stand for Procyclicality In Government Spending?" Maravalle, A ; Claeys, P.

WP 2010/14 "Economic and social convergence in Colombia" Royuela, V; Adolfo García, G.

WP 2010/13 "Symmetric or asymmetric gasoline prices? A meta-analysis approach" Perdiguero, J.

WP 2010/12 "Ownership, Incentives and Hospitals" Fageda,X and Fiz, E.

WP 2010/11 "Prediction of the economic cost of individual long-term care in the Spanish population" Bolancé, C; Alemany, R ; and Guillén M

WP 2010/10 "On the Dynamics of Exports and FDI: The Spanish Internationalization Process" Martínez-Martín J.

WP 2010/09 "Urban transport governance reform in Barcelona" Albalate, D ; Bel, G and Calzada, J.

WP 2010/08 "Cómo (no) adaptar una asignatura al EEES: Lecciones desde la experiencia comparada en España" Florido C. ; Jiménez JL. and Perdiguero J.

WP 2010/07 "Price rivalry in airline markets: A study of a successful strategy of a network carrier against a low-cost carrier" Fageda, X ; Jiménez J.L. ; Perdiguero , J.

WP 2010/06 "La reforma de la contratación en el mercado de trabajo: entre la flexibilidad y la seguridad" Royuela V. and Manuel Sanchis M.

WP 2010/05 "Discrete distributions when modeling the disability severity score of motor victims" Boucher, J and Santolino, M

WP 2010/04 "Does privatization spur regulation? Evidence from the regulatory reform of European airports . Bel, G. and Fageda, X."

WP 2010/03 "High-Speed Rail: Lessons for Policy Makers from Experiences Abroad". Albalate, D ; and Bel, G."

WP 2010/02 "Speed limit laws in America: Economics, politics and geography". Albalate, D ; and Bel, G."

WP 2010/01 "Research Networks and Inventors' Mobility as Drivers of Innovation: Evidence from Europe" Miguélez, E. ; Moreno, R. "

WP 2009/26 "Social Preferences and Transport Policy: The case of US speed limits" Albalate, D.

WP 2009/25 "Human Capital Spillovers Productivity and Regional Convergence in Spain" , Ramos, R ; Artis, M.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2009/24 "Human Capital and Regional Wage Gaps" ,López-Bazo,E. Motellón E.

WP 2009/23 "Is Private Production of Public Services Cheaper than Public Production? A meta-regression analysis of solid waste and water services" Bel, G.; Fageda, X.; Warner. M.E.

WP 2009/22 "Institutional Determinants of Military Spending" Bel, G., Elias-Moreno, F.

WP 2009/21 "Fiscal Regime Shifts in Portugal" Afonso, A., Claeys, P., Sousa, R.M.

WP 2009/20 "Health care utilization among immigrants and native-born populations in 11 European countries. Results from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe" Solé-Auró, A., Guillén, M., Crimmins, E.M.

WP 2009/19 "La efectividad de las políticas activas de mercado de trabajo para luchar contra el paro. La experiencia de Cataluña" Ramos, R., Suriñach, J., Artís, M.

WP 2009/18 "Is the Wage Curve Formal or Informal? Evidence for Colombia" Ramos, R., Duque, J.C., Suriñach, J.

WP 2009/17 "General Equilibrium Long-Run Determinants for Spanish FDI: A Spatial Panel Data Approach" Martínez-Martín, J.

WP 2009/16 "Scientists on the move: tracing scientists' mobility and its spatial distribution" Miguélez, E.; Moreno, R.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2009/15 "The First Privatization Policy in a Democracy: Selling State-Owned Enterprises in 1948-1950 Puerto Rico" Bel, G.

WP 2009/14 "Appropriate IPRs, Human Capital Composition and Economic Growth" Manca, F.

WP 2009/13 "Human Capital Composition and Economic Growth at a Regional Level" Manca, F.

WP 2009/12 "Technology Catching-up and the Role of Institutions" Manca, F.

WP 2009/11 "A missing spatial link in institutional quality" Claeys, P.; Manca, F.

WP 2009/10 "Tourism and Exports as a means of Growth" Cortés-Jiménez, I.; Pulina, M.; Riera i Prunera, C.; Artís, M.

WP 2009/09 "Evidence on the role of ownership structure on firms' innovative performance" Ortega-Argilés, R.; Moreno, R.

WP 2009/08 "¿Por qué se privatizan servicios en los municipios (pequeños)? Evidencia empírica sobre residuos sólidos y agua" Bel, G.; Fageda, X.; Mur, M.

WP 2009/07 "Empirical analysis of solid management waste costs: Some evidence from Galicia, Spain" Bel, G.; Fageda, X.

WP 2009/06 "Intercontinental fligths from European Airports: Towards hub concentration or not?" Bel, G.; Fageda, X.

WP 2009/05 "Factors explaining urban transport systems in large European cities: A cross-sectional approach" Albalate, D.; Bel, G.

WP 2009/04 "Regional economic growth and human capital: the role of overeducation" Ramos, R.; Suriñach, J.; Artís, M.

WP 2009/03 "Regional heterogeneity in wage distributions. Evidence from Spain" Motellón, E.; López-Bazo, E.; El-Attar, M.

WP 2009/02 "Modelling the disability severity score in motor insurance claims: an application to the Spanish case" Santolino, M.; Boucher, J.P.

WP 2009/01 "Quality in work and aggregate productivity" Royuela, V.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2008/16 "Intermunicipal cooperation and privatization of solid waste services among small municipalities in Spain" Bel, G.; Mur, M.

WP 2008/15 "Similar problems, different solutions: Comparing refuse collection in the Netherlands and Spain" Bel, G.; Dijkgraaf, E.; Fageda, X.; Gradus, R.

WP 2008/14 "Determinants of the decision to appeal against motor bodily injury settlements awarded by Spanish trial courts" Santolino, M

WP 2008/13 "Does social capital reinforce technological inputs in the creation of knowledge? Evidence from the Spanish regions" Miguélez, E.; Moreno, R.; Artís, M.

WP 2008/12 "Testing the FTPL across government tiers" Claeys, P.; Ramos, R.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2008/11 "Internet Banking in Europe: a comparative analysis" Arnaboldi, F.; Claeys, P.

WP 2008/10 "Fiscal policy and interest rates: the role of financial and economic integration" Claeys, P.; Moreno, R.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2008/09 "Health of Immigrants in European countries" Solé-Auró, A.; M.Crimmins, E.

WP 2008/08 "The Role of Firm Size in Training Provision Decisions: evidence from Spain" Castany, L.

WP 2008/07 "Forecasting the maximum compensation offer in the automobile BI claims negotiation process" Ayuso, M.; Santolino, M.

WP 2008/06 "Prediction of individual automobile RBNS claim reserves in the context of Solvency II" Ayuso, M.; Santolino, M.

WP 2008/05 "Panel Data Stochastic Convergence Analysis of the Mexican Regions" Carrion-i-Silvestre, J.L.; German-Soto, V.

WP 2008/04 "Local privatization, intermunicipal cooperation, transaction costs and political interests: Evidence from Spain" Bel, G.; Fageda, X.

WP 2008/03 "Choosing hybrid organizations for local services delivery: An empirical analysis of partial privatization" Bel, G.; Fageda, X.

WP 2008/02 "Motorways, tolls and road safety. Evidence from European Panel Data" Albalate, D.; Bel, G.

WP 2008/01 "Shaping urban traffic patterns through congestion charging: What factors drive success or failure?" Albalate, D.; Bel, G.

WP 2007/19 "La distribución regional de la temporalidad en España. Análisis de sus determinantes" Motellón, E.

WP 2007/18 "Regional returns to physical capital: are they conditioned by educational attainment?" López-Bazo, E.; Moreno, R.

WP 2007/17 "Does human capital stimulate investment in physical capital? evidence from a cost system framework" López-Bazo, E.; Moreno, R.

WP 2007/16 "Do innovation and human capital explain the productivity gap between small and large firms?" Castany, L.; López-Bazo, E.; Moreno, R.

WP 2007/15 "Estimating the effects of fiscal policy under the budget constraint" Claeys, P.

WP 2007/14 "Fiscal sustainability across government tiers: an assessment of soft budget constraints" Claeys, P.; Ramos, R.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2007/13 "The institutional vs. the academic definition of the quality of work life. What is the focus of the European Commission?" Royuela, V.; López-Tamayo, J.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2007/12 "Cambios en la distribución salarial en españa, 1995-2002. Efectos a través del tipo de contrato" Motellón, E.; López-Bazo, E.; El-Attar, M.

WP 2007/11 "EU-15 sovereign governments' cost of borrowing after seven years of monetary union" Gómez-Puig, M..

WP 2007/10 "Another Look at the Null of Stationary Real Exchange Rates: Panel Data with Structural Breaks and Cross-section Dependence" Syed A. Basher; Carrion-i-Silvestre, J.L.

WP 2007/09 "Multicointegration, polynomial cointegration and I(2) cointegration with structural breaks. An application to the sustainability of the US external deficit" Berenguer-Rico, V.; Carrion-i-Silvestre, J.L.

WP 2007/08 "Has concentration evolved similarly in manufacturing and services? A sensitivity analysis" Ruiz-Valenzuela, J.; Moreno-Serrano, R.; Vaya-Valcarce, E.

WP 2007/07 "Defining housing market areas using commuting and migration algorithms. Catalonia (Spain) as an applied case study" Royuela, C.; Vargas, M.

WP 2007/06 "Regulating Concessions of Toll Motorways, An Empirical Study on Fixed vs. Variable Term Contracts" Albalate, D.; Bel, G.

WP 2007/05 "Decomposing differences in total factor productivity across firm size" Castany, L.; Lopez-Bazo, E.; Moreno, R.

WP 2007/04 "Privatization and Regulation of Toll Motorways in Europe" Albalate, D.; Bel, G.; Fageda, X.

WP 2007/03 "Is the influence of quality of life on urban growth non-stationary in space? A case study of Barcelona" Royuela, V.; Moreno, R.; Vayá, E.

WP 2007/02 "Sustainability of EU fiscal policies. A panel test" Claeys, P.

WP 2007/01 "Research networks and scientific production in Economics: The recent spanish experience" Duque, J.C.; Ramos, R.; Royuela, V.

WP 2006/10 "Term structure of interest rate. European financial integration" Fontanals-Albiol, H.; Ruiz-Dotras, E.; Bolancé-Losilla, C.

WP 2006/09 "Patrones de publicación internacional (ssci) de los autores afiliados a universidades españolas, en el ámbito económico-empresarial (1994-2004)" Suriñach, J.; Duque, J.C.; Royuela, V.

WP 2006/08 "Supervised regionalization methods: A survey" Duque, J.C.; Ramos, R.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2006/07 "Against the mainstream: nazi privatization in 1930s germany" Bel, G.

WP 2006/06 "Economía Urbana y Calidad de Vida. Una revisión del estado del conocimiento en España" Royuela, V.; Lambiri, D.; Biagi, B.

WP 2006/05 "Calculation of the variance in surveys of the economic climate" Alcañiz, M.; Costa, A.; Guillén, M.; Luna, C.; Rovira, C.

WP 2006/04 "Time-varying effects when analysing customer lifetime duration: application to the insurance market" Guillen, M.; Nielsen, J.P.; Scheike, T.; Perez-Marin, A.M.

WP 2006/03 "Lowering blood alcohol content levels to save lives the european experience" Albalate, D.

WP 2006/02 "An analysis of the determinants in economics and business publications by spanish universities between 1994 and 2004" Ramos, R.; Royuela, V.; Suriñach, J.

WP 2006/01 "Job losses, outsourcing and relocation: empirical evidence using microdata" Artís, M.; Ramos, R.; Suriñach, J.

IREA

Institut de Recerca en Economia Aplicada Regional i Pública
Research Institute of Applied Economics

Universitat de Barcelona
Av. Diagonal, 690 • 08034 Barcelona

WEBSITE: www.ub.edu/irea/ • **CONTACT:** irea@ub.edu